



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

A

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/761,756   | 01/18/2001  | Hiroshi Tokumaru     | FUR0014-US          | 6156             |
| 28970  | 7590        | 12/12/2005           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP<br>1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD<br>MCLEAN, VA 22102 |             |                      | TRAN, TONGOC        |                  |
|  |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        | 2134             |

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                         |                  |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.         | Applicant(s)     |  |
|                              | 09/761,756              | TOKUMARU ET AL.  |  |
|                              | Examiner<br>Tongoc Tran | Art Unit<br>2134 |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5 and 18-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on September 21, 2005. Claims 1-4 and 6-17 have been canceled. Claims 5 and 18-28 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665) in view of Shin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,134) and further in view of Mitra et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0014878 A1, hereinafter Mitra).

In respect to claim 5, Teper discloses a service providing system for providing a service to a user terminal device through a network, the system comprising a user verification device and a service providing device including at least one service providing web (see col. 2, line 1-col. 3, line 4),

wherein the user verification device judges whether or not a user of the user terminal device is a registrant and transmits an access ticket for accessing a service providing web to the terminal upon receipt of designation of a desired service providing

web through a service provider when the user verification means judge that the user of the terminal is a registrant (see col. 3, line 5-30),

wherein the service providing web judges whether or not a request for service accompanies the access ticket upon receipt of the request for service from the terminal device and provides a service to the terminal device when the service providing web judges that the request for service accompanies the access ticket (see col. 3, lines 30-45). Teper discloses the ticket is issued to the user terminal indirectly from the user verification device. However Shin discloses an access ticket is sent to the user to allow user to access to protected resource (see Shine, col. 1, lines 10-24 and col. 5, lines 11-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Teper's verification device issuing the ticket through the service provider with Shin's teaching of sending the access ticket to the user to enable the user to access protective resource for the benefit of freeing the service provider from the inconvenience caused by handling of large amount of information (see Shin, col. 2, lines 20-30). Furthermore, Teper discloses the service provider can anonymously bill the user for services subsequently purchased through the verification device. Teper does not explicitly disclose but Mitra discloses the charge-processing device for performing charge-processing to the user upon receipt of log information for charging a service charge and wherein the user verification device transmits the log information to the charge-processing device in response to issuance of the access ticket (Mitra, 0006). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Teper's

accessing ticket to a service provider website with a purchase request with purchase tokens issued from a verification device taught by Mitra for the benefit of gaining approval of the purchase when a buyer desires to purchase goods and services from a service provider.

In respect to claim 18, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the service providing system of claim 5, wherein the user verification device manages the information for verification for each of the service providing webs and controls issuance of the access ticket related to each of the service providing webs (see Teper, col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 5).

In respect to claim 19, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the service providing system of claim 5., wherein the user verification device manages common information for verification in relation to a plurality of service providing webs and controls issuance of the access ticket related to each of the service providing webs (see Teper, col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 5).

In respect to claim 20, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the service providing system of claim 5, the system further comprising: a charge-processing device for performing charge-processing to the user upon receipt of log information for charging a service charge, wherein the service providing web transmits the log information to the

charge processing device when a request for service accompanying the access ticket is received (see Teper, col. 3, lines 30-45).

In respect to claim 21, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the service providing system of claim 5, the system further comprising: a user-oriented recording part for storing service providing webs capable of being accessed by each user, and menu generating means for generating a user-oriented menu in accordance with content recorded in the user-oriented recording part when the user verification means judges that user is a registrant (see Teper, col. 1, lines 24-40).

In respect to claim 22, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the service providing system of claim 5, wherein the user verification device and the charge-processing device are composed of one computer (see Teper, col. 2, lines 57-67).

In respect to claim 23, Teper discloses the user verification device capable of communicating with a user terminal device,

wherein the user verification device judges whether or not a user of the user terminal device is a registrant and transmits an access ticket for accessing a service providing web to the terminal upon receipt of designation of a desired service providing web through a service provider when the user recording means judges that the user of the terminal is a registrant, said service providing web judging whether or not a request for service accompanies the access ticket upon receipt of the request for service from

the terminal device and providing a service to the terminal device when the service providing web judges that the request for service accompanies the access ticket (see col. 2, line 31-col. 3, line 30).

Teper discloses the ticket is issued to the user terminal indirectly from the user verification device. However Shin discloses an access ticket is sent to the user to allow user to access to protected resource (see Shine, col. 1, lines 10-24 and col. 5, lines 11-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Teper's verification device issuing the ticket through the service provider with Shin's teaching of sending the access ticket to the user to enable the user to access protective resource for the benefit of freeing the service provider from the inconvenience caused by handling of large amount of information (see Shin, col. 2, lines 20-30). Furthermore, Teper discloses the service provider can anonymously bill the user for services subsequently purchased through the verification device. Teper does not explicitly disclose but Mitra discloses the charge-processing device for performing charge-processing to the user upon receipt of log information for charging a service charge and wherein the user verification device transmits the log information to the charge-processing device in response to issuance of the access ticket (Mitra, 0006). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Teper's accessing ticket to a service provider website with a purchase request with purchase tokens issued from a verification device taught by Mitra for the benefit of gaining

approval of the purchase when a buyer desires to purchase goods and services from a service provider.

In respect to claim 24, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the user verification device of claim 23, wherein the user verification device manages the information for verification for each of the service providing webs and controls issuance of the access ticket related to each of the service providing webs (see Teper, col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 45).

In respect to claim 25, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the user verification device of claim 23, wherein the user verification device manages common information for verification in relation to a plurality of service providing webs and controls issuance of the access ticket related to each of the service providing webs (see Teper, col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 5).

In respect to claim 26, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the user verification device of claim 23, the device further comprising: a user-oriented recording part for storing service providing webs capable of being accessed by each user, and menu generating means for generating a user-oriented menu in accordance with content recorded in the user-oriented recording part when the user verification means judges that user is a registrant (see Teper, col. 1, lines 24-40).

In respect to claim 27, Teper, Shin and Mitra disclose the user verification device of claim 25, wherein the user verification device and the charge-processing device are composed of one computer (see Teper col. 2, lines 57-67).

In respect to claim 28, the claimed limitation is a method claim that is substantially similar to system claim 1. Therefore, claim 28 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

### *Conclusion*

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Examiner: Tongoc Tran  
Art Unit: 2134

December 6, 2005

  
GREGORY MORSE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100